



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

JOE
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/067,863	02/08/2002	Yoshitaka Sasaki	111926	9677
25944	7590	07/29/2004	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			TUPPER, ROBERT S	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2652		
DATE MAILED: 07/29/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/067,863	SASAKI ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Robert S Tupper	2652	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 April 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-11 and 16-53 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5 and 12-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

1. Applicant's election with traverse of the invention of Group I, claims 1-5 and 12-15 in the reply filed on 4/23/04 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the claims are sufficiently related that there is no serious burden. This is not found persuasive because it is in error. Method claims clearly involve totally separate issues. The non-elected apparatus claims include further issues related to the additional structures present required to constitute a magnetic head.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. Claims 6-11 and 16-53 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 4/23/04.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-5 and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being clearly anticipated by CLARKE et al (6,191,918).

Note figure 3. CLARKE et al shows a conductive pattern/pattern having first (320) and second (322) spaced conductive strips of copper (see column 5 lines 30-31) on a substrate (222,312) with an electrically insulating surface (316), a first insulating film (318) on the electrically insulating surface and the depressions between the first strips, the second conductive strips located on the first insulating film, a second insulating film (unnumbered section between side of 316 and outer turns of conductive strip 320) "outside" the conductive strips, and a third insulating film (324) on the flat upper surface of the conductive strips.

Furthermore, with regard to the manufacturing process limitations set forth in claims 2-5 and 13-15, it is noted that a "product by process" claim is directed to the product *per se*, no matter how actually made; see *In re Hirao*, 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (footnote 3, CCPA 1976); *In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685 (CCPA 1972); *In re Luck*, 177 USPQ 523 (CCPA 1973); *In re Fessmann*, 180 USPQ 324 (CCPA 1974); *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964 (CAFC 1985). The patentability of the Final product in a "product by process" claim must be determined by the product itself and not the actual process and an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in "product by process" claims or not. Accordingly, the weight given to the "product by process" limitation is the structure "gleaned" from the process, i.e., the structural elements listed in these claims.

5. Claims 1-5 and 12-15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by HONG et al (6,466,401).

Note figure 3. HONG et al shows a conductive pattern/pattern having first (20) and second (40) spaced conductive strips of copper (see column 1 lines 57-58) on a substrate (10) with an electrically insulating surface (115), a first insulating film (30) on the electrically insulating surface and the depressions between the first strips, the second conductive strips located on the first insulating film, a second insulating film (unnumbered side section of 30) "outside" the conductive strips, and a third insulating film (50) on the flat upper surface of the conductive strips.

Furthermore, with regard to the manufacturing process limitations set forth in claims 2-5 and 13-15, it is noted that a "product by process" claim is directed to the product *per se*, no matter how actually made; see *In re Hirao*, 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (footnote 3, CCPA 1976); *In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685 (CCPA 1972); *In re Luck*, 177 USPQ 523 (CCPA 1973); *In re Fessmann*, 180 USPQ 324 (CCPA 1974); *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964 (CAFC 1985). The patentability of the Final product in a "product by process" claim must be determined by the product itself and not the actual process and an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in "product by process" claims or not. Accordingly, the weight given to the "product by process" limitation is the structure "gleaned" from the process, i.e., the structural elements listed in these claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert S Tupper whose telephone number is 703-308-1601. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri, 6:00 AM - 3:30 PM (first Fri off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hoa Nguyen can be reached on 703-305-9687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Robert S Tupper
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2652

rst